

Ms. Jane E. Kirtley, Esq. Ex. Dir.
Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press
800 13 St., NW, #200
Washington, D.C. 20006

2/11/86

Dear Ms. Kirtley,

Because of illness and surgery your letter of 10/7/85 was buried on my desk. I'm sure you believe what you said and I think that makes it more outrageous. So your reporter "examined the pleadings filed in the case." And managed to refer to only those of the government that without refutation mine made clear were untruthful. By this standard, if you'd been reporting on Hitler, you'd have used only a condensation of his speeches.

In the field in which I work I am a minority of one. I'm the only so-called "critic" of the official investigations of the political assassinations who is not a conspiracy theorist. Mine is a study of how our institutions worked in those times of great crisis and since then. The press is one of our basic institutions, along with the courts and to a degree lawyers. If you've done nothing else you've provided a fine item for the university archive I'm leaving.

If your reporter had done what you claim, then it would have been apparent that I'd alleged perjury to procure the unprecedented "discovery" order for the first time in FOIA litigation and that my documented allegations were unrefuted. It happens that at the time of your letter I got "new evidence" in the form of FBI documents disclosed to another requester that thoroughly documents what I've since alleged pro se, (Rule 69a) that fraud, perjury and misrepresentation were the basis and the only basis of the discovery order and the subsequent money judgement against me. Once I was pro se I sent copies of the pleadings of both sides to about 30 in the press. It is, I think, fair commentary on the press we have today and the reporters who received copies that unadmitted allegations in court of FBI and Department of Justice fraud, perjury and misrepresentations, felonies, I believe, are not newsworthy. And you people who will be paying for what will happen, as I will not, will have earned your reward. Freedom of the press indeed with such concepts and standards!

It would have been much easier and enormously less costly for me to have just paid the judgement. It will take about three months of my Social Security. But I'm neither a phony nor a coward and I do care about what you people don't really give a damn about unless it hurts them and their paymasters personally.

I am reminded of an earlier case in which, among others, I approached your committee seeking the filing of an amicus brief. You and the other phonies didn't but despite your abdications I persevered and as a result the investigatory files exemption was amended in 1974. The establishment of which you are part was so prejudiced and so indifferent to the genuine interests of the establishment that not a word appeared when one determined man, if you recall your AG Jackson, made the system work. In my reporting days of the distant past that would have been news.

You close your letter with the offer to answer any specific questions I have. I have one: do you and yours really think it is not news when overwhelmingly documented and unrefuted allegations of serious felonies are attributed in court and subject to sanctions - particularly in FOIA litigation?

to the government

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg
7027 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21701